

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application. Claims 1-22 are now pending.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2004/0123238 to Hefetz et al.

Applicants' independent claim 1 requires, among other things, including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page. The Examiner cited to ¶ 0003 of Hefetz et al. as disclosing these limitations.

However, neither the cited portion nor any other portion of Hefetz et al. actually discloses including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page, as required by Applicants' independent claim 1. The cited text of Hefetz et al., ¶ 0003, states as follows:

A portal brings together various applications from an intranet and an extranet that may or may not be related to one another. Traditional portal software products have included portal development tools that allow creation of portal templates to be used at portal run-time to generate portal pages for display. Run-time portal templates, such as may be implemented using Java Server Pages (JSP) and custom tag libraries, provide an efficient way to combine static data with dynamic run-time data for presentation to a user in a portal environment.

The only time the cited text talks about what might be included in a dynamic portion of a portal template is the first sentence, which simply mentions "various applications from an intranet and an extranet that may or may not be related to one another." There is no specific mention of links to content, that the linked content is cached in a content engine, or of information about content availability, all as required by Applicants' independent claim 1. As the Examiner knows, for a rejection to be properly maintained under § 102, the cited reference must actually disclose all the limitations of the rejected claim. Here, with all due respect to the Examiner, a simple reading of the cited paragraph of Hefetz et al. shows that it clearly fails to disclose a limitation of Applicants'

independent claim 1, by not even remotely discussing the specific features of that limitation or even using phrases equivalent to the phrases found in the limitation.

The entirety of the Hefetz et al. reference suffers from the same failing. Applicants respectfully note that the word “link” does not appear at all in Hefetz et al., and the only time a derivate of the word appears (“linking”) is it in the context of the physical links that, when joined together, form a network (“The network 210 can be any communication network linking machines capable of communicating using one or more networking protocols”, ¶ 0032). Indeed, Hefetz et al. does not even suggest or imply that links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page are included in at least one dynamic portion of a portal template, as required by Applicants’ independent claim 1. Rather, Hefetz et al. discloses a system that improves the design of portals by providing a WYSIWYG layout editor that includes both static and dynamic content for a portal template. Hefetz et al., however, fails to ever disclose what that dynamic content is, and specifically, does not disclose including into the at least one dynamic portion of the portal template links to content cached in the content engine and information about content availability to generate a portal page, as required by Applicants’ independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least any of the reasons given above, Hefetz et al. does not disclose all the limitations of Applicants’ independent claim 1, and thus Applicants’ independent claim 1 is allowable over Hefetz et al.

Applicants’ independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 all include limitations similar to those of Applicants’ allowable independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants’ allowable independent claim 1, Applicants’ independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 are themselves not disclosed by Hefetz et al., and thus, Applicants’ independent claims 12, 15, 21, and 22 are allowable over Hefetz et al.

Applicants’ dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 depend from, respectively, Applicants’ allowable independent claims 1, 12, and 15. Therefore, for at least the

reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable independent claims 1, 12, and 15, Applicants' dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 are themselves not disclosed by Hefetz et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-11, 13-14, and 16-20 are allowable over Hefetz et al.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/SPM/

Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS03-50(7980)

Dated: September 13, 2007